

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04482 01 OF 05 201212Z

51

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07

H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 088578

P R 200914Z MAY 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2837

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 5 VIENNA 4482

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING, MAY 17, 1974

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. IN ITS MAY 17 MEETING, AHG DISCUSSED TACTICS TO FOLLOWING IN MAKING BEST USE OF THREE "BARGAINING COUNTERS" WHICH NEW NAC GUIDANCE AUTHORIZED. SUGGESTION OF UK REP, WHICH PREVAILED, WAS IN INTRODUCE THE THREE PIECEMEAL OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSIONS, AND THEN REFUSE TO GO FURTHER UNLESS THE PACT MADE SOME POSITIVE MOVE IN RETURN. GROUP WAS UNANIMOUS THAT THE MATERIAL SHOULD BE USED IN INFORMAL SESSIONS, AND SENSITIVE TO FRG REP (BEHREND) POINT THAT IF IT WERE NOT USED FAIRLY QUICKLY, MATERIAL WOULD LEAK OUT. ITALIAN REP (CAGIATI) URGED THAT ONLY ONE POINT BE USED AT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04482 01 OF 05 201212Z

FIRST, AND THE SECOND INTRODUCED ONLY AFTER SOME CORRESPONDING

SOVIET CONCESSION. WHILE ACCEPTING UK RECOMMENDATION US REP ARGUED THAT OPTIMUM POSITION WOULD BE TO USE ALL THREE AT ONCE, MAINTAINING THAT IF SOVIETS HAD DECIDED NOT TO MOVE AT ALL ALLIES NEEDED TO BE IN POSTURE TO RESIST A SOVIET EFFORT TO "GO PUBLIC," AND THAT IF SOVIETS WERE WILLING TO MOVE EVENTUALLY, THEN ALL THREE CUMULATIVELY WERE BARELY ENOUGH TO MAKE AN IMPACT. BELGIAN REP (ADRIAENSSSEN) SUPPORTED ITALIAN POSITION, PARTLY BECAUSE OF RELUCTANCE TO USE THE "REVIEW AFTER FIVE YEARS" POINT AT ALL. GROUP AGREED PROVISIONALLY TO USE MAY 22 AND 28 INFORMAL SESSIONS ON THE FREEZE BETWEEN PHASES, USE JUNE 5 FOR THE FIXED PERIOD OF TIME AND THE REVIEW, AND USE THE JUNE 11 INFORMAL TO INSIST THAT THE NEXT MOVE WAS UP TO THE SOVIETS. HOWEVER, IT WAS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE CONTENT OF INFORMALS WOULD BE REVIEWD EACH WEEK. GROUP ALSO REVISED AND APPROVED DRAFT OUTLINE FOR MAY 22. PLENERY STATEMENT. END SUMMARY.

OUTLINE FOR MAY 22ND PLENARY STATEMENT

2. PROLONGED DISCUSSION OF DRAFT OUTLINE FOR MAY 22 PLENARY STATEMENT (TO BE PRESENTED BY UK) FOCUSED ON 3 MAIN SUBSTANTIVE POINTS. THE FIRST WAS WHETHER THE STATEMENT SHOULD LAY STRESS UPON THE AGREEMENT THAT A COMMON CEILING AS AN OBJECTIVE WAS DESIRABLE IN ORDER TO BUILD "CONFIDENCE." IT EMERGED DURING THE DISCUSSION THAT TWO TYPES OF "CONFIDENCE" WERE AT ISSUE: THE FIRST WAS THE MUTUAL CONFIDENCE WHICH BOTH SIDES WOULD FEEL IN THE AFTERMATH OF AN AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING A COMMON CEILING, BECAUSE OF THE GREATER STABILITY SUCH PARITY WOULD PRODUCE. THIS WILL BE INCLUDED AS AN APPROPRIATE ARGUMENT FOR THE COMMON CEILING, BUT SUBORDINATED TO THE THERE OF STABILITY, SINCE THAT IS LIKELY TO BE MORE ATTRACTIVE TO THE WARSAW PACT. THE SECOND TYPE OF CONFIDENCE, WHICH IS THE PRECONDITION FOR THE WESTERN STATES TO UNDERTAKE PHASE II REDUCTIONS, WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE IN A PLENARY STATEMENT ON PHASING. THE US REP PROPOSED THAT, IN VIEW OF THE EMPHASIS PLACE DURING THE MAY 15TH INFORMAL AND THE MAY 16TH PLENARY ON THE INCLUSION OF ALL PARTICIPANTS IN REDUCTIONS FROM THE OUTSET, THE ALLIES' SUBSEQUENT PLENARY STATEMENT (ON JUNE 6) SHOULD BE ON THE SUBJECT OF PHASING AND COULD INCLUDE THE ARGUMENT. BELGIAN REP SUPPORTED THIS US POSITION, AND GROUP AGREED.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04482 01 OF 05 201212Z

3. THE SECOND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUE WAS RAISED BY A U.S. SUGGESTION THAT THE PRESENTATION BEGIN ON AN AFFIRMATIVE NOTE BY STATING THAT ALLIED PROPOSALS ARE AIMED AT "GREATER STABILITY", INSTEAD OF EMPHASIZING HOW DIFFICULT REDUCTIONS WOULD BE AS AN EXPLANATION OF THE NEED FOR CONFIDENCE. THE GROUP ACCPTED THIS REORDERING OF THE OUTLINE. THE GREEK REP (DOUNTAS) SUGGESTED THAT THE OPENING OF THE STATEMENT SHOULD ALSO ANSWER THE SOVIET CONTENTION THAT THE WESTERN APPROACH DOES NOT CONFORM

TO THE AGREED PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY. THE GROUP OBSERVED THAT THE PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY "IN ALL RESPECTS AND AT EVERY POINT" WAS TAKEN FROM THE AGREED FINAL COMMUNIQUE OF THE PREPARATORY TALKS, AND AGREED THAT THE WEST SHOULD MAKE RENEWED EFFORT TO CHARACTERIZE ITS OWN PROPOSALS AS NECESSARY TO PRESERVE UNDIMINISHED SECURITY IN CONTEXT OF DISCUSSION OF PHASING. HOWEVER, IT WAS FELT THAT THE OPENING OF THE STATEMENT SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON THE THERE OF STABILITY.

4. CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) SUGGESTED THAT THE SECTION DISCUSSING EXISTING FORCE DISPARITIES IN CENTRAL EUROPE SHOULD INCLUDE A REFERENCE TO THE BUILD-UP OF SOVIET FORCES SINCE 1968. FRG REP (BEHREND) THOUGHT THAT THIS MIGHT BE EXPRESSED SAYING THAT THESE DISPARITIES WERE GREATER THAN THEY EVER HAD BEEN BEFORE. US REP AGREED WITH LATTER FORMULATION BUT CALLED ATTENTION TO THE AGREEMENT BY THE GROUP DURING THE WINTER THAT IF THE GROUP USED EXPLICIT REFERENCE TO SOVIET FORCE INCREASE ONCE, IT WOULD NOT BE USED AGAIN. MOREOVER, THE FACT THAT THE NEW NATO DATA MIGHT LOOK TO THE EAST LIKE AN INCREASE OF 20,000 IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS MADE THIS LINE OF ARGUMENT A DANGEROUS ONE, GROUP AGREED THAT THE STATEMENT WOULD NOT REFER EXPLICITLY TO THE SOVIET BUILD-UP BUT MIGHT CONTAIN A GENERALIZED REFERENCE ON LINES OF FRG FORMULATION.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04482 02 OF 05 201225Z

51

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07

H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 088703

P R 200914Z MAY 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2838

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 5 VIENNA 4482

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

TACTICS FOR INFORMAL SESSIONS

5. THE CHAIRMAN (FRG REP BEHREND) NOTED THAT THE AHG HAD NOW RECEIVED GUIDANCE FROM NAC ON THREE ASSURANCES TO THE EAST REGARDING PARTICIPATION BY NON-US NATO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN REDUCTIONS: A FIXED PERIOD OF TIME BETWEEN PHASES, A NON-INCREASE OF FORCES COMMITMENT, AND A PROVISION FOR REVIEW OF THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT AFTER FIVE YEARS. THE AHG NOW NEEDED TO DECIDE THE BEST WAY TO USE THIS AUTHORITY.

6. THE CANADIAN REP OPENED DISCUSSION BY ASKING FOR A CLARIFICATION OF THE UK REP'S REMARKS AT A PREVIOUS SESSION. HE THOUGHT THAT UK REP HAD SUGGESTED THAT, WHEN GUIDANCE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04482 02 OF 05 201225Z

WAS RECEIVED FROM NATO, IT SHOULD BE USED FOR PLENARY PRESENTATIONS. THE CANADIAN REP SUGGESTED THAT THIS PROCEDURE WOULD BE INADVISABLE -- THE INSTRUCTIONS SHOULD BE USED IN THE INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS. THE UK REP CLARIFIED HIS REMARKS, EXPLAINING THAT HE HAD BEEN TALKING OF TWO DIFFERENT THINGS. ON ONE HAND, WHEN THE AHG RECEIVES GUIDANCE FROM NATO ON OTHER ISSUES SUCH AS STABILIZING MEASURES AND VERIFICATION, THIS SHOULD BE USED FOR PLENARY STATEMENTS. ON THE OTHER HAND, PRESENT GUIDANCE ON THE THREE ASSURANCES SHOULD BE USED IN INFORMALS. IF, AS A RESULT OF INTRODUCING THESE INSTRUCTIONS IN THE INFORMAL SESSIONS, THE SIDES CAME TO ANY AGREEMENTS IN THE INFORMAL SESSIONS, THE ALLIES MIGHT THEN WISH TO "PROMULGATE" THE RESULTS IN PLENARY STATEMENTS.

7. THE UK REP THEN INTRODUCED A TENTATIVE PROGRAMME FOR MULTILATERAL INFORMAL MEETINGS DURING THIS CURRENT (THIRD) ROUND. THIS SCHEDULE PROPOSED TWO INFORMAL SESSIONS ON MAY 22 AND 28, ON THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. A THIRD SESSION, ON JUNE 5, WOULD ADDRESS THE ASSURANCES ON FIXED PERIOD OF TIME AND REVIEW PROCEDURE. A FOURTH SESSION ON JUNE 11, WOULD BE DEVOTED TO A RECAPITULATION OF THE THREE ASSURANCES, WITH A VIEW TOWARD RECEIVING AN EASTERN RESPONSE. A FIFTH SESSION, ON JUNE 18, WOULD

TURN TO THE SUBJECT OF DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES.

8. THE UK REP SAID THAT THIS SCHEDULE WAS NOT INTENDED AS A FORMAL PROPOSAL, BUT AS BASIS OF DISCUSSION ON HOW TO INTRODUCE THE ASSURANCES TO THE EAST. ALLIED APPROACH WOULD HAVE TO BALANCE THE NEED TO EMPLOY THE CONCESSIONS IN SUCH A WAY AS TO AVOID SHOWING THE WHOLE HAND WITHOUT GETTING ANYTHING IN RETURN WITH THE NEED TO SHOW THE EAST THAT THE ALLIES HAVE DEVELOPED A SUBSTANTIAL BARGAINING POSITION WHICH THEY ARE READY TO INTRODUCE. THE UK REP EXPLAINED THAT HIS PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF INFORMAL SESSIONS REFLECTED THE VIEW THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD GRADUALLY UNFOLD THE THREE ASSURANCES, STARTING WITH THE MOST IMPORTANT OF THE THREE -- THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. SCHEDULE ENVISAGES TWO SESSIONS BEING DEVOTED TO THIS QUESTION, ONE IN WHICH THE ALLIES WOULD INTRODUCE THE CONCEPT, AND A SECOND IN WHICH THE ALLIES WOULD ELABORATE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04482 02 OF 05 201225Z

ON IT AND ENGAGE IN DISCUSSION WITH THE EAST ABOUT IT. HE NOTED THAT IF THE EAST DID NOT AGREE TO THE ALLIED PHASING CONCEPT AS A RESULT OF THIS ONE ASSURANCE, THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO DECIDE WHETHER TO PRESENT THE OTHER ASSURANCES. SINCE IT WAS UNLIKELY THAT THE ONE ASSURANCE WOULD BE SUFFICIENT, HIS PROPOSAL ENVISAGED GIVING THE EAST ALL THREE ASSURANCES. AFTER INTRODUCTION OF ALL THREE ASSURANCES, THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT THIS WAS THE LIMIT OF ALLIED CONCESSIONS ON THE QUESTION OF WEST EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS. THE FOURTH SESSION IN THE SCHEDULE FOR RECAPITULATION WAS INTENDED TO DO THIS. THE UK REP SUGGESTED THAT IF THE EAST WAS STILL NOT WILLING TO MOVE ON PHASING, THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO MOVE TO SWITCH THE DISCUSSION TO OTHER SUBJECTS, SUCH AS THE DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES.

9. THE CANADIAN REP SUPPORTED UK REP'S REMARKS AND THE PROPOSED SCHEDULE. HE ASKED HOW ROSE ENVISAGED USE OF THE FOURTH ASSURANCE, ON " ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS", WHEN THAT GUIDANCE WAS RECEIVED FROM NATO. HE SAID HE PRESUMED FROM THE SCHEDULE THAT ROSE WOULD NOT USE THAT ASSURANCE BEFORE JULY, AND ASKED IF THAT PRESUMPTION WAS CORRECT. THE UK REP SAID HE HAD NOT WANTED TO PREJUDGE WHAT INSTRUCTIONS THE AHG WOULD RECEIVE ON THIS FOURTH ASSURANCE, AND THEREFORE, HAD NOT INCLUDED IT IN THE SCHEDULE. HE BELIEVED THIS ASSURANCE REPRESENTED A MORE SUBSTANTIVE CONCESSION THAN THE OTHER THREE, AND THAT IF THE AHG DID RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONS TO GO AHEAD WITH IT, THE ALLIES MIGHT WANT TO HANDLE THIS ASSURANCE DIFFERENTLY, AFTER EASTERN RESPONSES TO THE OTHER THREE HAD BEEN ASSESSED. HE THOUGHT THAT UNLESS EAST MOVED ON PHASING

THE "ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS" FORMULA MIGHT BEST BE USED
JUST BEFORE THE SUMMER RECESS, AS SOMETHING FOR THE EAST
TO PONDER DURING RECESS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04482 03 OF 05 201235Z

51

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07

H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 088794

P R 200914Z MAY 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2839

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 5 VIENNA 4482

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

10. THE ITALIAN REP OBJECTED TO THE PROPOSED SCHEDULE, ARGUING
THAT GIVING AWAY ALL OF THE ALLIED CONCESSIONS WITHOUT GETTING
SOMETHING SPECIFIC FROM THE EAST IN RETURN FOR EACH WAS A BAD
IDEA. HE POINED OUT THAT THE LAST INFORMAL OF MAY 15 DEMONSTRATED
THAT THE EAST WAS TAKING A HARD POSITION. HE SAID THIS SHOULD
BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT: WEST SHOULD TAKE A HARD POSITION IN RETURN.
THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION SHOULD ONLY HINT AT THE ASSURANCES
(AS THE US REP HAD DONE AT THE MAY 15 SESSION), AND FORCE THE
EAST TO TELL ALLIES EXACTLY WHAT THEY WANT, SO THAT THE
ALLIES COULD BETTER CONTROL THE NEGOTIATIONS.

11. THE ITALIAN REP SUGGESTED THE ALLIES SHOULD ALSO TAKE A HARDER POSITION ON THE COMMON CEILING IN THE INFORMAL SESSIONS. THE ALLIES SHOULD TELL THE EAST THAT IF THEY DID NOT ACCEPT THE SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04482 03 OF 05 201235Z

COMMON CEILING, THERE WAS NO HOPE FOR AGREEMENT, JUST AS THE EAST WAS SAYING THERE WAS NO HOPE FOR AGREEMENT WITHOUT WEST EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS FROM THE OUTSET. HE SUGGESTED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD GO EVEN FURTHER AND REMIND THE EAST THAT A COMMON CEILING DID EXIST IN THE AREA BEFORE 1968. THE ALLIES SHOULD SAY THAT THE EAST IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CURRENT LACK OF A COMMON CEILING, AND SHOULD THEREFORE REDUCE MORE TO RE-ESTABLISH A COMMON CEILING. THE ALLIES COULD THEN SAY THAT IF THE EAST IS WILLING TO MAKE REDUCTIONS TO A COMMON CEILING, THE ALLIES WOULD BE WILLING, IN RETURN, TO SATISFY EASTERN CONCERNS ABOUT WEST EUROPEAN PARTICIPATION. THE ITALIAN REP EMPHASIZED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD GET SOMETHING IN RETURN FOR THESE ASSURANCES.

12. THE BELGIAN REP AGREED WITH THE VIEW THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT USE ALL THEIR CARDS AT ONCE, AND AGREED WITH UK REP'S REMARKS IN THIS REGARD. HE SUGGESTED, HOWEVER, THAT A MAY 22 INFORMAL SESSION ON THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WAS A BIT TOO FAST A PACE. HE POINTED OUT THAT THE MAY 15 SESSION SHOWED THAT THE EAST WAS NOT UNDER ANY TIME PRESSURE, AND SUGGESTED THAT IT WOULD BE UNWISE FOR THE ALLIES NOT TO REACT TO THIS HARDENED ATTITUDE WITH A HARDER POSITION OF THEIR OWN. HE THEREFORE AGREED WITH THE ITALIAN REP THAT AT THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION THE ALLIES SHOULD MAKE A STATEMENT ON PHASING AND THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT AS HARD-LINED AS THE EASTERN POSITION ON WEST EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS. THE ALLIES SHOULD MAKE THESE TWO CONCEPTS A SINE-QUA-NON OF AN AGREEMENT. THE BELGIAN REP SAID HE THEREFORE RECOMMENDED A MORE CAUTIOUS PROCEDURE THAN THE UK PROPOSED SCHEDULE. HE SAID THE ALLIES SHOULD USE THE TIME BETWEEN MAY 22 AND JUNE 5 TO CONTACT NATO FOR FURTHER ELABORATION OF GUIDANCE ON THE FIXED PERIOD OF TIME PROPOSAL, WHICH COULD THEN BE DISCUSSED AT THE JUNE 5 SESSION.

13. REGARDING THE JUNE 5 SESSION, THE BELGIAN REP CAUTIONED THE AHG ABOUT DEALING WITH THE ASSURANCE FOR REVIEW OF THE PHASE I AGREEMENT TOO CASUALLY. HE EXPLAINED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAD OBJECTIONS TO THE REVIEW PROCEDURE AS CURRENTLY WORDED BECAUSE IT WOULD INVITE THE SOVIETS TO BLACKMAIL NATO, AND WOULD BE SEEN BY PUBLIC OPINION AS ESTABLISHING A CONDOMINIUM. (COMMENT: BELGIAN REP AS APPARENTLY REFERRING TO THE OPTICAL EFFECTS OF A PROVISION THAT ONLY THE US OR USSR COULD TERMINATE THE AGREEMENT. END COMMENT) BELGIAN REP SAID THAT WHILE HIS SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04482 03 OF 05 201235Z

AUTHORITIES AGREED THAT A REVIEW PROVISION COULD BE ADDED TO A PHASE I AGREEMENT AS A PROCEDURAL ELEMENT, THE ADVISED AGAINST ITS POLITICAL USE AS AN INCENTIVE TO GAIN SOVIET AGREEMENT TO PHASE I. HOWEVER, THIS TOPIC COULD BE DISCUSSED LATER IN MORE DETAIL.

14. FRG REP POINTED OUT THAT RAISING THE SUBJECT OF THE COMMON CEILING AT THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE AGREEMENT REACHED WITH THE EAST THAT THE SUBJECT OF WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED FROM THE OUTSET WOULD BE DISCUSSED. HE ALSO POINTED OUT THAT SINCE IT WON'T BE POSSIBLE TO KEEP THESE NATO INSTRUCTIONS SECRET FOR VERY LONG, THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT HESITATE TOO LONG BEFORE USING THEM FOR BEST EFFECT. HE THOUGHT THE UK SCHEDULE WAS REASONABLE. HE POINTED OUT THAT THE ALLIES ARE ASKING THE EAST TO ACCEPT THE ALLIED CONCEPT OF PHASING AND THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT IN RETURN FOR ALL THESE ASSURANCES. IT WAS DIFFICULT TO SUBDIVIDE EASTERN AGREEMENT TO PHASING INTO COMPONENT PARTS; THERE WAS NO PLAUSIBLE QUID-PRO-QUO FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL ASSURANCE. IN FACT, HE NOTED, OTHER THINGS WILL HAVE TO BE INTRODUCED LATER TO EACH AGREEMENT ON PHASE I -- THESE THREE ASSURANCES WOULD NOT BE SUFFICIENT. HE SAID IT WAS UNLIKELY THAT THE EAST WOULD SHOW A POSITIVE RESPONSE IF ONLY ONE OR TWO OF THE ASSURANCES WERE INTRODUCED, AND THOUGHT IT INEVITABLE THAT ALL THREE WOULD HAVE TO BE INTRODUCED. THEN, IF THE EAST REMAINED UNRESPONSIVE, THE ALLIES WOULD MOVE TO A DIFFERENT SUBJECT.

15. THE BELGIAN REP SAID HE WOULD NOT DWELL ON THE SUBJECT ANY FURTHER, BUT WANTED TO EMPHASIZE HIS AUTHORITIES'S RESERVATIONS ABOUT USING THE ASSURANCE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04482 04 OF 05 201245Z

51

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07

H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 088895

P R 200914Z MAY 74
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2840
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO USMISSION NATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 5 VIENNA 4482

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

ON REVIEW. REGARDING THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION MAY 22,
HE EXPLAINED THAT HE WAS NOT AGAINST INTRODUCING THE NON-INCREASE
COMMITMENT, BUT DID HAVE A TACTICAL OBJECTION. SINCE THE EAST
HAD HARDENED THEIR POSITION, THE ALLIES SHOULD PROCEED MORE
CAUTIOUSLY ON THESE ASSURANCES.

16. THE UK REP OBSERVED THAT HIS VIEWS WERE NOT INCONSISTENT
WITH THE VIEWS OF THE BELGIAN AND ITALIAN REPS ON THE QUESTION
OF TIMING. HE POINTED OUT THAT THE FIRST INFORMAL SESSION WOULD
NOT BE DEVOTED SOLELY TO THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT: OBVIOUSLY,
THE ALLIES WOULD INTRODUCE AND LEAD UP TO THAT SUBJECT BY DISCUSSING
ALLIED OBJECTIVES GENERALLY. HE AGREED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD
MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT IS
PROPOSED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ALLIED PHASE I PROPOSAL, WHICH
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04482 04 OF 05 201245Z

INCLUDES ARGEEMENT OF THE COMMON CEILING WILL INEVITABLY BE
RAISED. HE POINTED OUT, HEWEVER, THAT THE DISCUSSION WOULD HAVE
TO START OFF IN THE CONTEXT OF WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED
FIRST, AS AGREED WITH THE EAST.

17. THE BELGIAN REP INTERJECTED THAT HE APPRECIATED UK REP'S
REMARKS, BUT WARNED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT GIVE THE EAST
THE IMPRESSION THAT THEY CAN MAKE WEST CAVE IN BY ADOPTING A
HARDER POSITION ON THEIR PART. THE ITALIAN REP AGAIN TOOK ISSUE
WITH THE THRUST OF THE DISCUSSION. HE DREW ATTENTION TO THE
NATO INSTRUCTIONS TO THE AHG WHICH STIPULATED THAT THESE ASSURANCES
CAN BE USED "IF AND AS JUSTIFIED BY THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
TACTICAL NEGOTIATING SITUATION," AND THAT "ALL POINTS
WOULD BE CONTINGENT ON REACHING A SATISFACTORY FIRST PHASE
AGREEMENT, INCLUDING THE COMMITMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING
CONCEPT". HE AGAIN CAUTIONED THAT THE ALLIES HAVE ONLY A FEW

CARDS AND NEED TO EXERCISE CARE IN PLAYING THEM.

18. THE US REP SAID HE SUPPORTED THE CONCEPT OF PROCEEDING ALONG THE LINES OF THE UK SCHEDULE, EVEN THOUGH THE US DELEGATION HAD ORIGINALLY HAD A DIFFERENT CONCEPT THAN THE ITALIAN REP HAD. IT WAS HIS VIEW THAT ALL THREE ASSURANCES SHOULD BE INTRODUCED AT ONCE, RATHER THAN ONE AT A TIME. EXPLAINING THE REASONING BEHIND THIS CONCLUSION, HE POSTULATED TWO POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS OF SOVIET MOTIVATIONS. EITHER THEIR HARDENED POSITION REFLECTS A LONG-TERM SHIFT AND IS COMPLETELY FIRM ON THE QUESTION OF WESTER EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS, OR IT IS A TACTICAL MANEUVER, AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE, DEPENDING ON CSCE OR OTHER EXTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS. IN EITHER CASE, THE US VIEW IS TO PROCEED DELIBERATELY IN LAYING OUT THE FIRST THREE ASSURANCES, PLACING BLAME ON SOVIETS FOR STONEWALLING, BUT HOLDING BACK ON THE "ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS" FORMULA AS A NEGOTIATING RESERVE.

19. THE US REP CONTINUED THAT PRESENT HARDENING RESULTS FROM SHIFT IN THE EASTERN POSITION, THE SOVIETS WOULD PROBABLY EVENTUALLY GO PUBLIC AND THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO ENGAGE IN A PUBLIC DEBATE. THEREFORE, THE ALLIES NEEDED A REASONABLE POSITION TO DEFEND, AND THE REASONABLENESS OF THE ALLIED POSITION WOULD BE ENHANCED IF THE ALLIES HAD AVANCED SUBSTANTIVE ANSWERS, TO A PRIMARY EASTERN CONCERN ABOUT WEST EUROPEAN FORCES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04482 04 OF 05 201245Z

ON THE OTHER HAND, IF THE SOVIET HARDENING OF POSITION IS SIMPLY A TACTICAL MANEUVER, AND THERE IS A CHANCE THAT THEY WILL COMPROMISE, THE ALLIES WILL ASSUREDLY NEED ALL THREE, AND PROBABLY ALL FOUR ASSURANCES, TO MAKE THE ALLIED PHASE I PROPOSAL ATTRACTIVE TO THE EAST. EVEN WITH ALL FOUR ASSURANCES, THE CHANCES THAT THE EAST WILL ACCEPT THE ALLIED PHASING CONCEPT ARE PROBLEMATIC, SINCE THERE ARE MANY OTHER EASTERN CONCERNS WHICH THE ALLIES ARE NOT PREAPRED TO ADDRESS, SUCH AS AIR FORCES AND HOW MUCH THE WEST EUROPEANS WILL REDUCE.

20. THE US REP EXPLAINED THAT THE ALLIES HAD, IN THE MAY 15 INFORMAL SESSION, STARTED THE PROCESS OF DEFINING EASTERN PROBLEMS TO WHICH ALLIES HAD ANSWERS. HE SUGGESTED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD CONTINUE THE MAY 22 SESSION ALONG THESE SAME LINES. HE NOTED THAT

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04482 05 OF 05 201252Z

51

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07

H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 088960

P R 200914Z MAY 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2841

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 5 VIENNA 4482

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

HAVING THE ALLIES TAKE THE LEAD IN FOCUSING THE INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS ON THOSE EASTERN PROBLEMS WHICH WE WERE WILLING TO ANSWER GAVE THE ALLIES BETTER CONTROL OVER THE NEGOTIATIONS; IT WOULD AT THE SAME TIME GIVE THE EAST A CLEAR SIGNAL THAT THE ALLIES WERE READY TO DO BUSINESS ON PHASING AND ESTABLISH A LIMIT TO THE TOPICS THE ALLIES WERE WILLING TO HANDLE UNDER THIS HEADING.

21. THE ITALIAN REP SAID HE ACCEPTED THE US REP'S ARGUMENTATION, THOUGH HE DOUBTED THERE WOULD BE A NEED TO GO PUBLIC. HOWEVER, HE REPEATED HIS OBJECTION THAT THE NATO GUIDANCE LINKS THESE ASSURANCES MORE TO THE COMMON CEILING THAN TO PHASING, WHEREAS THE US REP APPEARED TO PLACE MORE EMPHASIS ON PHASING. HE THEREFORE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04482 05 OF 05 201252Z

RECOMMENDED THAT THE SUBJECT OF THE COMMON CEILING BE ADDRESSED IN THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION--TO MAKE THAT

LINKAGE CLEAR TO THE EAST. THE US REP POINTED OUT THAT THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT IS CONDITIONAL ON EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF PHASE I, WHICH INCLUDES THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT. HE FURTHER OBSERVED THAT THE NATO INSTRUCTIONS CALL FOR THE AHG TO CONTINUE PURSUING THE OBJECTIVE

OF GETTING THE EAST TO ACCEPT THE ALLIED PHASING CONCEPT. HE REPEATED THE FACT THAT ALL THESE ASSURANCES ARE MADE CONTINGENT ON ACCEPTANCE OF THE PHASE I PACKAGE. THE ITALIAN REP THANKED THE US REP FOR HIS REMARKS AND AGAIN EMPHASIZED THAT THESE CONDITIONS SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR TO THE EAST.

2. THE NETHERLANDS ACTING REP (VON BALLUSECK) SAID THAT AMBASSADOR QUARLES WANTED HIM TO EXPRESS GENERAL AGREEMENT WITH THE REMARKS OF THE US REP, BUT TO NOTE THAT SUCCESSIVE INTRODUCTION OF THE ASSURANCES SHOULD BE MADE CONTINGENT UPON A POSITIVE EASTERN RESPONSE.

23. THE ITALIAN REP CLOSED THE DISCUSSION WITH THE OBSERVATION THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE GROUP CLEARLY HAD A DIFFERENT VIEW THAN HIS, BUT THAT, IF THE UK SCHEDULE WERE ACCEPTED, THE AHG SHOULD REVIEW AND ASSESS EACH INFORMAL SESSION TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE SCHEDULE SHOULD BE CONTINUED. GROUP EXPRESSED AGREEMENT WITH THIS VIEW.

24. NEXT AHG MEETING SCHEDULED FOR MAY 21. HUMES

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: POLICIES, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETINGS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 20 MAY 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974VIENNA04482
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740124-0756
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740532/aaaabcgi.tel
Line Count: 629
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 12
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <26 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <08 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING, MAY 17, 1974
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005